

1 BRUCE L. SIMON (Bar No. 96241)
bsimon@pswplaw.com
2 WILLIAM J. NEWSOM (Bar No. 267643)
wnewsom@pswplaw.com
3 **PEARSON, SIMON, WARSHAW & PENNY, LLP**
44 Montgomery Street, Suite 2450
4 San Francisco, California 94104
Telephone: (415) 433-9000
5 Facsimile: (415) 433-9008

6 *Attorneys for Plaintiff*
REUBEN JOSEPH REYES

7 KAMALA D. HARRIS
8 Attorney General of California
JAY C. RUSSELL
9 Supervising Deputy Attorney General
MICHAEL J. QUINN
10 Deputy Attorney General
State Bar No. 209542
11 455 Golden Gate Avenue, Suite 11000
San Francisco, CA 94102-7004
12 Telephone: (415) 703-5726
Fax: (415) 703-5843
13 E-mail: Michael.Quinn@doj.ca.gov

EDISON FEDERAL BLDG

14 *Attorneys for Defendants*
FISCHER, HARRISON, HOREL, TERRY, CHADWICK, and BERKLER

16 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**

17 **NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, SAN JOSE DIVISION**

19 REUBEN JOSEPH REYES,

CASE NO. C 08-4561 RMW (PR)

20 Plaintiff,

**STIPULATION AND []
ORDER CONTINUING:**

21 vs.

22 ROBERT A. HOREL, et al.,

**1. DEADLINE TO REPLY TO
PLAINTIFF'S OPPOSITION TO
DEFENDANTS' RENEWED MOTION
FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT; AND
2. RELATED DEADLINES**

23 Defendants.

24 [Civil Local Rules 6-2 and 7-12]

26 Honorable Ronald M. Whyte

27

28

1 1. The following stipulation requests that the deadline for filing a reply to
2 Plaintiff's Opposition to Defendants' Renewed Motion for Summary Judgment, currently set for
3 January 17, 2012, be extended by two days to **January 19, 2012**, and that all related deadlines be
4 continued accordingly.

STIPULATION

7 Pursuant to Civil Local Rules 6-2 and 7-12, Plaintiff Reuben Reyes and Defendants
8 Horel, Terry, Chadwick, Harrison, Fischer, and Berkler, by and through their respective counsel,
9 stipulate and request as follows:

10
11 1. WHEREAS, on January 10, 2012, Plaintiff filed an Opposition to
12 Defendants' Renewed Motion for Summary Judgment (Docket No. 120), setting the deadline for a
13 reply to the opposition as January 17, 2012, per local rule 7-3(c);

15 2. WHEREAS, counsel for Defendants is in the process of preparing a reply to
16 the opposition, but requires several additional days in order to respond to the lengthy opposition,
17 which consists of 25 pages of text and several declarations;

19 3. WHEREAS, with respect to Civil L.R. 6-2(a)(1), the parties have conferred
20 regarding particular reasons an extension of the deadline is mutually-agreeable, including that
21 Defendants are in the process of preparing the reply but require a short extension of time to
22 complete it;

24 4. WHEREAS, with respect to Civil L.R. 6-2(a)(2), the previous time
25 modifications in this action include: a) Defendants' motion to change time for filing a dispositive
26 motion, which was granted by this Court on April 15, 2009 (Docket No. 21); b) a second motion
27 to change time filed by Defendants in order to enable Defendant Chadwick to join Defendants
28 Horel, Berkler, Harrison, and Fischer's Motion for Summary Judgment, granted by this Court on

1 August 25, 2009 (Docket No. 65.); c) a Stipulation and [Proposed] Order Continuing: 1. Non-
2 Expert Discovery Cut-Off; and 2. Related Deadlines (Docket No. 104), filed May 27, 2011; d) a
3 Stipulation and [Proposed] Order Continuing: 1. Non-Expert Discovery Cut-Off; and 2. Related
4 Deadlines (Docket No. 105), filed June 30, 2011; e) a Stipulation and [Proposed] Order
5 Continuing: 1. Non-Expert Discovery Cut-Off; and 2. Related Deadlines (Docket No. 110), filed
6 October 12, 2011; Stipulation and [Proposed] Order Continuing Deadline to Respond to
7 Defendants' Renewed Motion for Summary Judgment (Docket No. 119); and

9 5. WHEREAS, with respect to Civil L.R. 6-2(a)(3), a two day continuance of
10 the deadline to complete the reply to Plaintiff's Opposition to Defendants' Renewed Motion for
11 Summary Judgment and related deadlines will not at this stage have a significant effect on the
12 overall schedule for this case;

14 NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED AND REQUESTED that the
15 Court continue the deadline to reply to Plaintiff's Opposition to Defendants' Renewed Motion for
16 Summary Judgment to **January 19, 2012**, and continue all related deadlines accordingly.

E-FILING ATTESTATION

20 By his signature below, and pursuant to General Order 45, counsel for Defendants
21 attests that counsel for all parties whose electronic signatures appear below have concurred in the
22 filing of this Stipulation.

24 | Dated: January 13, 2012

By: /s/ William J. Newsom
PEARSON, SIMON, WARSHAW & PENNY, LLP

1 Dated: January 13, 2012

By: /s/ Michael J. Quinn
2 Deputy Attorney General

3 *Attorneys for Defendants FISCHER, HARRISON,*
4 *HOREL, TERRY, CHADWICK, and BERKLER*

5 **ORDER**

6 PURSUANT TO STIPULATION, IT IS SO ORDERED.

7
8 Dated: FEB 28 G

9
10 The Honorable Ronald M. Whyte
11 United States District Court Judge



12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28